DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 667 TM 035 361

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Klecker, Beverly M.; Lennex, Lesia; Lackner, Katherine |
| TITLE | Evaluating the Integration of Technology in a Teacher Preparation Program. |
| PUB DATE | 2003-10-00 |
| NOTE | 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Columbus, OH, October 2003). |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Course Content; *Educational Technology; Interviews; Program Evaluation; Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; *Technology Integration |

ABSTRACT

The Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology grant at Morehead State University, Kentucky, was designed to have an immediate, simultaneous impact on the education of teacher candidates, professional development of university faculty, and curriculum reform. In the third year of the grant (2002-2003), evaluation focused on the integration of technology into teacher education courses. Data were collected through interviews with 92 teacher education faculty members and the content analysis of 240 syllabi for the same courses. The unit of analysis was the course. Analysis of interview and syllabus data shows that although 100% of the faculty interviewed reported integration of technology into the courses, there were differences among the technology standards incorporated. Analysis of course syllabi shows 15 courses with no mention of technology integration. Discrepancies in the data and the next steps toward curriculum integration and alignment are discussed. An appendix contains state and National Educational Technology standards for technology integration. (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: EVALUATING THE INTEGRATION OF TECHNOLOGY

ED 481 667

# Evaluating the Integration of Technology in a Teacher Preparation Program

Beverly M. Klecker

Lesia Lennex

Katherine Lackner

Morehead State University

Morehead, KY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Klacker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

Mid-Western Educational Research Association

Columbus, OH

October 17, 2003

TM035361



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology ($PT^3$) grant at Morehead State University was designed to have an immediate, simultaneous impact on the education of teacher candidates, professional development of university faculty, and curriculum reform. In the third year of the grant (2002-2003), evaluation focused on the integration of technology into teacher education courses. Data were collected through (1) interviews with teacher education faculty, and (2) content analysis of syllabi for the same courses (N=240). The unit of analysis was the course. Analysis of the interview and syllabi data found that although 100% of the faculty interviewed reported integration of technology into the courses, there were differences among the technology standards incorporated. Analysis of course syllabi found 15 of the courses with no mention of technology integration. Discrepancies between the data as well as the next steps toward curriculum integration and alignment are discussed.

Evaluating the Integration of Technology in a Teacher Preparation Program Purpose of the Study

The context for this study is the teacher education program at Morehead State University, a regional state university of approximately 9,000 students in northeastern Kentucky. The university's Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology ($PT^3$) grant, funded in 2000, was designed to have an immediate, simultaneous impact on the education of teacher candidates, professional development of university faculty, curriculum reform, and provision of technology rich field experiences.

*Purpose of the Study*

This evaluation study was undertaken during the third year (2002-2003) of the PT3 grant to examine the level of technology integration in courses in the teacher education program. The study was planned to yield information for both grant evaluation and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) program documentation. The evaluation goal measured by the study was one of five goals established at the time of the grant proposal: ***The number of the university's faculty who effectively model technology-based instructional strategies and practices will double within five years.***

This goal had been measured the first two years of the grant by paper-and-pencil surveys. The first year a faculty survey queried the use and integration of "technology" as a single entity. This lack of definition resulted in somewhat ambiguous results, yet provided some baseline data.

The second year a survey instrument designed around the sixteen performance criteria of Kentucky's New Teacher Technology Standard IX (Appendix) was used to delineate aspects of technology. This Kentucky's New Teacher Technology Standard is one of nine New Teacher Standards that frame Kentucky's teacher education programs. Further, these Standards are used as evaluative criteria for teacher interns. Passing the year long, standards-based evaluation during

the intern year is a requirement for teacher certification in Kentucky. Thus, the second-year survey instrument had better content validity than the instrument used the first year. Yet, a very low return (N=14) the second year inhibited generalizing the results across the teacher education faculty and courses. The first author of this study was employed as evaluator for the third and fourth years of the grant.

*Theoretical Framework*

In 1995, NCATE introduced technology expectations for schools of education and in 2000 issued updated accreditation standards that increased accountability for the integration of technology in teacher education programs. Paper-and-pencil and online surveys have frequently been used to evaluate technology integration in teacher education programs (e.g., Gershner, Snider, Huestis & Foster, 2000; Jacobsen, 1998; Vannatta, 2000).

The use of structured interviews (Patton, 1990), and content analysis (Airasian & Gay, 2002) of course syllabi using state (Education Professional Standards Board, 1999) and national (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003; NCATE, 2003) technology standards as guides is presented to offer new approaches to integration evaluation.

*Method*

Two data sources were used for the study: (1) face-to-face faculty interviews using a standards-based instrument, and (2) content analysis of teacher education program course syllabi. The unit of analysis for this study was the individual course. The measures obtained for the study were not independent as individual faculty members provided interview data for more than one course and designed more than one syllabus.

In spring 2003, course syllabi for 240 separate courses were available electronically on the College of Education's NCATE Web site at Morehead State University. This list of syllabi

was printed and served as the target population of faculty members for the interviews. (By fall of 2003 an additional 20 course syllabi were placed on the College of Education's website, thus, the percentage of courses in the teacher education program evaluated for this study was 93.2%.)

*Faculty interview data collection.*

The graduate student working with the project contacted by phone and arranged face-to-face interviews with all faculty teaching the 240 courses (N=92). The graduate student used the Kentucky New Teacher Technology Standards-based instrument to collect data during the interview. Each interview was recorded on a separate data sheet.

The technology categories on the Kentucky New Teacher Technology Standards-based instrument were then coded using the National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003) (Appendix). The six NET Standards allowed for additional comparisons of the interview data. The faculty interview data were analyzed using Statistical Analysis Software (SAS).

*Syllabi content analysis.*

The course syllabi all 240 courses were available in electronic format on Morehead State University's College of Education's website. The graduate student accessed each syllabus in Microsoft word format and used the word search function to identify technology requirements in the syllabus. These were copied and pasted as qualitative data into a database. The six NETS were used to code the qualitative data. Course labels and NETS codes were then entered into an Excel spread sheet and were analyzed using Excel.

*Results*

*Structured interviews with faculty.* Aggregate data from the structured faculty interview presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Faculty Interviews on Integration of Technology Standards (N=240 Courses)

| Kentucky New Teacher Standard IX | Frequency and Percentage of Courses in Which Standard is Taught | National Educational Technology Standard (NETS) |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Operates a multimedia computer and materials to install and use a variety of software. | 163 (67.9%) | I |
| 2. Uses terminology related to computers and technology appropriately in written and verbal communication. | 190 (79.2%) | I |
| 3. Demonstrates knowledge of the use of technology in business, industry, and society. | 170 (70.8%) | I |
| 4. Demonstrates basic knowledge of computer/peripheral parts and attends to simple connections and installations. | 123 (51.2%) | I |
| 5. Creates multimedia presentations using scanners, digital cameras, and video cameras. | 145 (60.4%) | III |
| 6. Uses the following to enhance professional productivity and support instruction: (a) computer to do word processing, | 185 (77.1%) | V, II |
| (b) create databases and spreadsheets, | 129 (53.8%) | V, II |
| (c) access electronic mail, | 199 (82.9%) | V, II |
| (d) access and use the Internet, | 219 (91.2%) | V, II |
| (e) make presentations, | 167 (69.6%) | V, II |
| 7. Uses the following to enhance professional productivity and support instruction: computer to do word processing, | 152 (66.3%) | V, II |
| (a) audio/video conferencing, | 47 (20.3%) | V, II |
| (b) other distance learning applications. | 51 (21.2%) | V, II |
| 8. Requests and uses appropriate assistive and adaptive devices for students with special needs. | 77 (37.7%) | III, VI |
| 9. Designs lessons that use technology to address diverse student needs and learning styles. | 150 (62.5%) | III, VI |
| 10. Practices equitable and legal se of computer and technology in professional activities. | 146 (60.8%) | VI |
| 11. Facilitates lifelong learning of self and others through the use of technology. | 159 (66.3%) | V |
| 12. Explores technology resources; software, applications, and related documentation; | 157 (65.4%) | II |
| 13. Applies researched-based instructional practices that use computers and other technology. | 137 (57.1%) | II |
| 14. Uses computers and other technology for individual, small group, and large group learning activities. | 185 (77.1%) | II |
| 15. Uses technology to support multiple assessments of student learning. | 119 (49.6%) | IV |
| 16. Instructs and supervises students in the ethical and legal use of technology. | 123 (51.2%) | VI |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interviews were conducted with faculty teaching 240 of the 260 (92.3%) courses in the teacher education program at Morehead State University. All of the faculty members interviewed reported integration of technology in the courses they taught. The data in Table 1 indicate that the performance criteria integrated into the highest percentage of courses is criteria six "Uses the following to enhance professional productivity and support instruction...access and use of the Internet (91.2%)." The technology performance criterion with the lowest percentage of course integration was number seven, "Uses the following to enhance professional productivity and support instruction. . . audio/video conferencing (20.3%)."

The NET Standard most frequently integrated in the teacher education courses was Standard II, " PLANNING AND DESIGNING LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS AND EXPERIENCES..." (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003, p. 1). The NET Standard least frequently integrated was Standard IV, "IV.ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION. *Teachers apply technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies...*" (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003, p. 2).

*Syllabi content analysis.* Table 2 below presents the Frequencies and Percentages of the National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) by course. Thus, 213 of the 240 courses (88.8%) included NETS I, Technology Operations and Concepts. This was the most frequently mentioned NET Standard in course syllabi. The least frequently mentioned NET Standard in course syllabi was Standard VI, Social, Ethical, Legal, and Human Issues.

Table 2. Frequencies and Percentages of NETS Standards in Course Syllabi (N=240)

| National Educational Technology Standard | Number of Courses Including Standard | Percentage of Courses Including Standard |
|---|---|---|
| I Technology Operations and Concepts | 213 | 88.8% |
| II Planning and Designing Learning Environments and Experiences | 55 | 22.9% |
| III Teaching, Learning, and the Curriculum. | 63 | 26.3% |
| IV Assessment and Evaluation. | 41 | 17.1% |
| V Productivity and Professional Practice. | 49 | 20.4% |
| VI Social, Ethical, Legal, and Human Issues | 20 | 8.3% |

The frequencies and percentages in Table 2 do not sum to 240 or 100% because the course syllabi often included more than one standard. On the other hand, some course syllabi--surprisingly--included no mention of technology. This was surprising because faculty members have been strongly encouraged to include course objectives linked to Kentucky's New Teacher Standards. Further, this strong encouragement extended to the NCATE standards--and technology had been emphasized throughout the teacher education program via the PT3 grant. Nevertheless, the data in Table 3 below indicate that the syllabi for 15 of the courses did not mention technology.

Table 3. Frequencies and Percentages of NETS in Individual Course Syllabi

| Number of Technology Standards in Syllabi | Number of Courses | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| No technology use mentioned in syllabi | 15 | 6.3% |
| One NET Standard included in syllabi | 128 | 53.3% |
| Two NET Standards included in syllabi | 47 | 19.6% |
| Three NET Standards included in syllabi | 26 | 10.8% |
| Four NET Standards included in syllabi | 8 | 3.3% |
| Five NET Standards included in syllabi | 6 | 2.5% |
| Six NET Standards included in syllabi | 10 | 4.1% |
| Total | 240 | 99.9% |

*Discussion*

Through the faculty interviews, the evaluation team learned that technology integration has increased at Morehead State University over the past three years. Learning that 100% faculty teaching 240 teacher education courses (92.3% of all courses in the program) had integrated technology into their course was a surprising finding.

Further, technology was better defined in this evaluation study by considering both the Kentucky New Teacher Technology Standard IX and the National Educational Technology Standards developed by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). When compared, Kentucky's Technology Standard and the NETS have much in common, yet have differences. The NETS are more broadly defined and seem to be less prescriptive. For example the NETS use the inclusive term "technology" throughout. In contrast, the Kentucky New Teacher Technology Standard IX delineates specific technologies in some of the Performance Criteria, for example, "6. Uses the computer to do word processing, create databases and spreadsheets, access electronic mail and the Internet, make presentations, and uses other emerging technologies to enhance professional productivity and support instruction" (Education Professional Standards Board, 1999, p. 1).

The very surprising finding from this study was that 15 courses had no mention of technology in the course syllabi. Informal discussions of syllabus writing and style among teacher education faculty may explain some discrepancies between interview data and syllabi data. Unless faculty members were very familiar with the six NET Standards, we would not expect to find all six of these standards listed in the syllabus.

The next steps being discussed among teacher education faculty members is developing an integrated technology curriculum, that is, identifying the aspects of technology that the

candidates will need to be able to know and be able to use as they enter teaching then specifying the course or courses in which the knowledge and skills will be developed. Not every course needs to integrate all six NETS or all 16 performance criteria of the Kentucky's New Teacher Technology Standard IX; however, all should be integrated in a systematic way throughout the teacher education curriculum. The next steps in the process are to (1) have open discussions about writing course syllabi, and (2) take a "curricular view" for technology integration. The methodology used in this evaluation study resulted in very positive reactions from faculty members, good interviewing experience for the graduate student, and a deeper understanding of "technology" by all.

References

Airasian, P.W., & Gay, L.R. (2002). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (7th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Education Professional Standards Board (1999). *New teacher standards for preparation and certification*. Retrieved May 2, 2003 from http://www.kyepsb.net/standards/new_teach_stds.html

Gershner, V. T., Snider, S. L., Huestis, A., Foster, J. M. (2000). *Integrating technology at the pre-service teacher level: Examining the process of change*. Paper presented at the Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference, San Diego, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED444536)

International Society for Technology in Education (2003). *Educational technology standards and performance indicators*. Retrieved May 2, 2003 from http://cnets.iste.org/teachers/t_stands.html

Jacobsen, D. (1998). *Adoption patterns of faculty who integrate computer technology for teaching and learning in higher education*. Presented at the World Conference on Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, Freiburg, Germany. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED428675)

NCATE (2003). *Program standards*. Retrieved May 2, 2003 from http://www.ncate.org/standard/programstds.htm

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Vannatta, R. A. (2000). Evaluation to planning: Technology integration in a school of education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 8*, 231-46.

# APPENDIX

Kentucky New Teacher Technology Standard IX

National Educational Technology Standards (NETS)

NEW TEACHER STANDARD IX (Education Professional Standards Board, 1999).

DEMONSTRATES IMPLEMENTATION OF TECHNOLOGY
The teacher uses technology to support instruction; access and manipulate data; enhance professional growth and productivity; communicate and collaborate with colleagues, parents, and the community; and conduct research.

PERFORMANCE CRITERIA:

The extent to which the teacher:

1. Operates a multimedia computer and peripherals to install and use a variety of software.
2. Uses terminology related to computers and technology appropriately in written and verbal communication.
3. Demonstrates knowledge of the use of technology in business, industry, and society.
4. Demonstrates basic knowledge of computer/peripheral parts and attends to simple connections and installations.
5. Creates multimedia presentations using scanners, digital cameras, and video cameras.
6. Uses the computer to do word processing, create databases and spreadsheets, access electronic mail and the Internet, make presentations, and uses other emerging technologies to enhance professional productivity and support instruction.
7. Uses computers and other technologies such as interactive instruction, audio/video conferencing, and other distance learning applications to enhance professional productivity and support instruction.
8. Requests and uses appropriate assistive and adaptive devices for students with special needs.
9. Designs lessons that use technology to address diverse student needs and learning styles.
10. Practices equitable and legal use of computers and technology in professional activities.
11. Facilitates the lifelong learning of self and others through the use of technology.
12. Explores, uses, and evaluates technology resources: software, applications, and related documentation.
13. Applies research-based instructional practices that use computers and other technology.
14. Uses computers and other technology for individual, small group, and large group learning activities.
15. Uses technology to support multiple assessments of student learning.
16. Instructs and supervises students in the ethical and legal use of technology.

National Educational Technology Standards (NETS)
Educational Technology Standards and Performance Indicators for All Teachers
(International Society for Technology in Education, 2003, pp. 1-3)

I. TECHNOLOGY OPERATIONS AND CONCEPTS.
*Teachers demonstrate a sound understanding of technology operations and concepts. Teachers:*

A. demonstrate introductory knowledge, skills, and understanding of concepts related to technology (as described in the ISTE National Education Technology Standards for Students)
B. demonstrate continual growth in technology knowledge and skills to stay abreast of current and emerging technologies.

II. PLANNING AND DESIGNING LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS AND EXPERIENCES.
*Teachers plan and design effective learning environments and experiences supported by technology. Teachers:*

A. design developmentally appropriate learning opportunities that apply technology-enhanced instructional strategies to support the diverse needs of learners.
B. apply current research on teaching and learning with technology when planning learning environments and experiences.
C. identify and locate technology resources and evaluate them for accuracy and suitability.
D. plan for the management of technology resources within the context of learning activities.
E. plan strategies to manage student learning in a technology-enhanced environment.

III. TEACHING, LEARNING, AND THE CURRICULUM.
*Teachers implement curriculum plans, that include methods and strategies for applying technology to maximize student learning. Teachers:*

A. facilitate technology-enhanced experiences that address content standards and student technology standards.
B. use technology to support learner-centered strategies that address the diverse needs of students.
C. apply technology to develop students' higher order skills and creativity.
D. manage student learning activities in a technology-enhanced environment.

IV. ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION.
*Teachers apply technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies. Teachers:*

A. apply technology in assessing student learning of subject

matter using a variety of assessment techniques.

B. use technology resources to collect and analyze data, interpret results, and communicate findings to improve instructional practice and maximize student learning.

C. apply multiple methods of evaluation to determine students' appropriate use of technology resources for learning, communication, and productivity.

V. PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.

*Teachers use technology to enhance their productivity and professional practice. Teachers:*

A. use technology resources to engage in ongoing professional development and lifelong learning.

B. continually evaluate and reflect on professional practice to make informed decisions regarding the use of technology in support of student learning.

C. apply technology to increase productivity.

D. use technology to communicate and collaborate with peers, parents, and the larger community in order to nurture student learning.

VI. SOCIAL, ETHICAL, LEGAL, AND HUMAN ISSUES.

*Teachers understand the social, ethical, legal, and human issues surrounding the use of technology in PK-12 schools and apply those principles in practice. Teachers:*

A. model and teach legal and ethical practice related to technology use.

B. apply technology resources to enable and empower learners with diverse backgrounds, characteristics, and abilities.

C. identify and use technology resources that affirm diversity.

D. promote safe and healthy use of technology resources.

E. facilitate equitable access to technology resources for all students.

1

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

ERIC

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

TM035361

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Evaluating the Integration of Technology in a Teacher Education Program

Author(s): Beverly M. Klecker, Lesia Lennex, Katherine Lackner

Corporate Source: Mid-Western Educational Research Association

Publication Date: October 17, 2003

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

| | |
|---|---|
| Signature: Beverly M. Klecker | Printed Name/Position/Title: Beverly M. Klecker, Assistant Professor |
| Organization/Address: Morehead State Univ. 503 Ginger Hall Morehead, KY 40351 | Telephone: 606 783 2536 FAX: 606 783 5032 |
| | E-Mail Address: b.klecker@morehead-st.edu Date: Oct. 29 2003 |

(over)

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|---|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name: |
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

**ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION**
**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND**
**1129 SHRIVER LAB**
**COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701**
**ATTN: ACQUISITIONS**

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
**4483-A Forbes Boulevard**
**Lanham, Maryland 20706**

**Telephone: 301-552-4200**
**Toll Free: 800-799-3742**
**FAX: 301-552-4700**
**e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov**
**WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com**

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)